DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 728 HE 022 702

AUTHOR Iram, Yaacov
TITLE Israel's "Planning and Grants Committee": A Case Study of Autonomy and Control in Higher Education.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 89
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Centralization; Decision Making; Foreign Countries; *Governance; *Institutional Autonomy; Institutional Role; *Leadership; Organizational Effectiveness; *Postsecondary Education; *Power Structure; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Israel

ABSTRACT

The higher education system in Israel is discussed, noting that tertiary education in that country makes a clear distinction between higher (university and academic) education and postsecondary eduction that is largely vocational. The Planning and Grants Committee (PGC) of the Council for Higher Education is responsible for the budgets of Israel's eight universities. Israel also has a group of specialized institutions of higher education which can only award the Bachelor's degree. They are under the aegis of the PGC. Six teacher training institutions are handled by a special permanent committee set up by the Council. Institutions that provide certain academic courses under the academic supervision of a university (e.g. regional colleges) are also found in Israel and financed by the Ministry of Education and Culture and regional authorities. About 30% of all research and development in Israel is carried out in the universities. The PGC has become the most powerful and central organization in higher education as a result of a gradual withdrawal of the government from its direct involvement. In recent years universities have questioned the validity of the allocation methods employed by the PGC and have even protested against its decisions. The outcomes of the present inherent tension between autonomy and control remain to be seen. Tables are included. Contains 20 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309728

ISRAEL'S "PLANNING AND GRANTS COMMITTEE" - A CASE STUDY OF AUTONOMY AND CONTROL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Yaacov Iram

Deputy Director
School of Education
Bar Ilan University
Ramat Gan, Israel

The 1989 Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association (AERA)
San Francisco, March 27-31, 1989

epared for Session on: Institutional Planning, Accreditation, Viability and Renewal.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Yaacov Iram

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 022 702

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Yaacov Iram, Bar Ilan University, Israel

ISRAEL'S "PLANNING AND GRANTS COMMITTEE" - A CASE STUDY OF AUTONOMY AND CONTROL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Higher Education System in Israel

Tertiary education in Israel makes a clear distinction between (1) higher (university and academic) education, which, ''includes teaching, science and research'' as defined in the Council for Higher Education Law, 1958 (Stanner, 1963); and (2) post-secondary education that is largely vocational.

The higher education system in Israel in 1987 consists of: seven institutions at university level, Everyman's (Open) University, seven non-university institutions of higher education and six institutions in the process of academization (CHE, PGC, Annual Report No. 14, 1988).

Institutions where academic studies are held may be divided into four groups: the first group consists of the seven universities, listed here in chronological order, namely

- Technion - Israel Institute of Technology (1924)
- The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1925)
- The Weizmann Institute of Science (1949)
- Bar-Ilan University (1955)
- Tel-Aviv University (1956)
- The University of Haifa (1963)
- Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (1964).

An additional university which in 1980 was accredited by the Council for Higher Education (CHE) and authorized to award the degree of Bachelor is:

- Everyman's (Open) University.

The Planning and Grants Committee (PGC) of the Council for Higher Education (CHE) is responsible for their budgets as will be discussed later.

The second group consists of specialized institutions of higher education which are not universities or teacher training colleges. These institutions are authorized to award only the Bachelor's degree. They are also under the aegis of the PGC.

The third group consists of six teacher training institutions, that have received either permit or accreditation to award the "Bachelor of Education" degree by the Council for Higher Education. These institutions are financed by the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Council for Higher Education set up a special permanent committee to deal with them.

The fourth group consists of institutions, such as regional colleges, which provide certain academic courses under the academic supervision of a university. Students in such courses are considered as students of the university; teachers are appointed and degrees awarded by the university. These are not independent institutions of higher education, however, they must be taken into account in any overall plan for the system. The regional colleges are financed by the Ministry of Education and Culture

and by various regional authorities. The Council for Higher Education has appointed a special committee to deal with academic courses at regional colleges.

Institutions of higher education other than the seven universities concentrate on studies for the degree of Bachelor only (see Table I for fields of study in the institutions of higher education).

The number of students at the seven university-level institutions reached some 67,900 in 1988, an increase of almost 30% over the last ten years. Some 60% of the students are studying humanities, social sciences and law, 23.3% natural sciences, agriculture and medicine, and 16.7% engineering. Some 72% are studying for the first degree (Bachelor), 21% for the second degree (Master), 5% for the Doctorates, and 2% for Academic Diploma. At the thirteen non-university institutions of higher education there were some 5,800 students. Some 13,500 were enrolled in academic courses of the Everyman's (Open) University, this number being equal to some 2,300 students in full time study programs at a regular university. (CHE, PGC Report 14, 1988; Statistical Abstracts 39, 1988).

As for the comparative rate of study in Israel it is difficult to compare the number of students in Israel with numbers in Western countries. There are differences arising out of variations in the division between university and post-secondary education existing in different countries. The principal age-group attending universities in Israel differs from other countries due to three years of army service for men and two years for women. It may, however, be said that in Israel the

ratio of students to the population of the relevant age groups is close to that in France, Italy and the Netherlands, far below the number in the United States and a little less than in Japan (CHE, 1984).

Background Characteristics and Developments

Higher education in Israel shares goals with similar institutions elsewhere: manpower training, furthering economic development, scientific research, enriching the culture and transmitting and advancing knowledge in general (Clark, 1983). In addition to these general goals, Israeli higher education institutions play an important role in the strengthening of Jewish scholarship and the transmission of its culture as well as forging cultural links with the Jewish people in the Diaspora. Indeed, the socio-historical roots of higher education in Israel are connected with the Zionist idea of cultural and national revival (Iram, 1983, Ben-David, 1986). Thus the two institutions which were founded before the establishment of the State of Israel, the Technion (Israel Institute of Technology) in 1924, and the Hebrew University in 1925, were meant to help generate the Jewish cultural revival and the realization of the Zionist program by providing the pragmatic technological and technical needs of the Yishuv, the Jewish community in Palestine (Iram 1980, 1983; Ben-David 1986).

After the establishment of the state there was a growing interest and need in establishing new higher education institutions. Indeed four new universities were established between

1955 and 1964. The Weizmann Institute of Science opened in 1949 as a research institute, and in 1958 it opened also a graduate school awarding only M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees. While the Everyman's (Open) University, which opened in 1976, was accredited in 1980 and authorized to award the degree of Bachelor (Halperin, 1984). As a result the growth in the number of first degree students became the most conspicuous feature of the expansion of the higher educational system (see Table II) though not the most important. Three of the five new universities founded since 1955 owe their establishment to local initiative (Tel Aviv, Haifa and Ben Gurion Universities), one to that of a Zionist religious organization (Bar-Ilan University) and the open university to governmental initiative and philantropic support (Rothschild Foundation).

Inspite the distinct origins of the universities established in the 1950s and 60s, they tended to imitate the two veteran higher education institutions, the Hebrew University and the Haifa Technion, stressing research as measures for strength and success of an institution as a whole and of particular departments within each of them (Iram, 1983). Indeed, the long standing tradition of the unity of research and teaching is responsible for the growth of research in Israeli Universities which is their single most important feature.

The government, although covering an increasingly part of the operating-ordinary budgets of the universities, did not interfere with the universities' academic autonomy emphasizing research as its supreme goal. This policy continues to guide

Israeli higher education today and was echoed in the 1986/87 annual report of the Planning and Grants Committee of the Council for Higher Education: "The universities are engaged both in teaching and research, teaching not accompanied by research cannot ensure proper academic level for any length of time" (p. 87).

Thus, it is estimated that about 30% of all research and development in Israel, including military research, and about 45% of the civilian research and development in the natural sciences, medicine, agriculture and engineering is carried out in the universities. Most of the research in the humanities and social sciences and virtually all the basic research in the country takes place in the universities (CHE, 1988).

The Council for Higher Education and the Planning and Grants Committee

When the State of Israel was established in 1948 there were two universities and one research institute. The number of students at that time was about 2,500. The universities enjoyed academic self government and played a decisive role in their administrative matters as well. As a result no professional academic administration evolved in the Israeli universities. All positions of power are held by temporary officials elected by the faculty from its own ranks. Excessive participatory democracy of

senior faculty and the veto power of their assemblies and senates prevented the emergence of effective academic leadership (Ben-David, 1986).

The opening of new universities in the 1950s and 1960s and growing demand for public and governmental funding of these institutions have brought to light the issue of accreditation of new universities as well as the problem of means and criteria for the allocation of funds for their ordinary and capital budgets by the Ministry of Finance as well as the issue of control. In 1958 the government established the Council for Higher Education (CHE) as a statutory body. The Council members are appointed by the President of the State for five years, and include the Minister of Education and Culture who is ex officio its Chairman. Section 4a states that ''at least two thirds of its members must be persons of standing in the field of higher education'' namely full professors. The council performs three main functions: (1) it recommends to the Government the granting of a permit to open a new institution of higher education; (2) it recommends to the the Government the granting of academic recognition or accreditation to institutions or to specific programs in institutions of higher education; and (3) confers the right to award academic degrees (Stanner, 1963: 244-9). Section 15 of the law guaranteed the autonomy of higher education not only in its academic conduct but also in its administrative and financial affairs:

> ''An accredited institution shall be at liberty to conduct its academic and administrative affairs within the framework of its budget... [this liberty] includes the determination of a program of research and

teaching, the appointment of the authorities of the institution, the appointment and promotion of teachers, the determination of a method of teaching and study, and any other scientific, pedagogic or economic activity'' (Ibid).

The continuous growth of the higher eeducation system was accompanied by a massive increase in public expenditure which rose steadily to 45.5% in 1959/60 and to almost 80% in 1974/75. Following increased government involvement in higher education, the basic issue became how to reconcile the inherent conflict between academic freedom and accountability to the public. From 1948 to 1971 the universities enjoyed direct access to the Ministry of Finance. The presidents of the universities submitted their budgetary requests independently to senior officials in the Finance Ministry, whose officers were not always familiar with the issues on hand in higher education. Thus, increasing doubts were raised about the competency of the state to cope with the rapid expansion of higher education (Zadok, 1984).

The autonomous governing body of each university decided on its development policy without coordination either with other universities or with the government. As a result almost all universities incurred increasing deficits and after the creation of **faits accomplis** the state was asked for additional resources. Since 1965 various proposals were suggested by several governmental committees which were charged with drafting a scheme and a mechanism which will make the universities more

accountable to the public (Kleinberger 1969, Bendor, 1977). The first step in this direction was the transfer of university affairs from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Education and Culture. An ammendment in 1972 to the Council for Higher Education Law of 1958 charged the Council with the responsibility of planning higher education. However, there was a growing need to work out an equitable system for financing higher education. A committee chaired by Professor Shalon was appointed by the Minister of Education and Culture to examine alternative models of university finance. In its report the committee recommended to adopt the model of the British University Grants Committee (UGC - Dainton, 1977).

In 1974 the Council for Higher Education adopted the Shalon report and appointed the first Planning and Grants Committee (PGC). The PGC has six members, including its Chairman. At least four of its members, including the chairman, must be full professors appointed **ad personam**, the other two members come from business and industry. ''The four professors represent 'the two cultures': two from the humanities, social sciences, law or education; two from the natural sciences, engineering, medicine or agriculture'' (CHE, 1985, p. 95).

All PGC members are appointed by the Minister of Education and Culture with the approval of the Council for Higher Education by secret ballot which safeguards against state intervention. The chairman of the PGC is employed full time and is ex-officio a member of the Council. He is assisted by an administrative and professional staff of 18-19 persons.

The Terms of Reference of the Planning and Grants Committee, as set forth in Government Decision No. 666 of June 5, 1977, are as follows:

''1. To be an independent body coming between the Government and the national institutions, on the one hand, and the institutions of higher education, on the other, in all matters relating to allocations for higher education... 2. To submit the ordinary and development budget proposals for higher education... 3. To allocate to the institutions of higher education the global approved ordinary and development budgets. 4. To submit to the Government and to the Council for Higher Education plans for the development of higher education, including their financing. 5. To encourage efficiency in the institutions of higher education and coordination between them... 6. To ensure that budgets are balanced ... 7. To express its opinion to the Council for Higher Education before the Council reaches a decision on the opening of a new institution or a new unit in an existing institution having financial implications.'' (CHE, PGC Report 13, 1985/86. p.12-13).

The PGC submits annual reports to the Council at the end of each academic year. Its composition, terms of reference, and modes of operation guarantee against the erosion of academic freedom of the higher education as a whole while providing for greater accountability by the universities who may negotiate on their budgets only with the PGC. However, this freedom is becoming limited for the individual institution in dealing with the PGC, as will be discussed later.

Funding Planning and Control

The Israeli Planning and Grants Committee (PGC) ''the planning and executive arm of the Council for Higher Education'' (CHE, 1984) has become the most powerful and central organization in higher education. This development is a result of a gradual withdrawal of the Government from its direct involvement in higher education and was reinforced by the universities' concession of power to the authority of the PGC in fiscal and planning matters. The PGC insisted upon two main functions: The careful examination of ''new units having financial implications'' and the implementtion of budgetary procedures both with the universities and the Government. Following its terms of reference, the PGC assumed also planning, evaluation and promotion duties, in addition to its funding role. This obliged the universities to submit to the PGC their plans for future academic development and operate within the framework of their approved budgets (Zadok, 1984).

There was a gradual but constant increase in the funding planning, and supervision powers of the PGC during its first term (1974-1979). This was not only a result of the weakness of the Government and the universities, but also an outcome of the PGC's sensitivity to the universities' needs which it has demonstrated time and again and its involvement in the promotion of higher education. For instance, the PGC initiated the allocation of earmarked grants to critical needs such as scientific equipment, university libraries and basic research, and funded appointment

of promising young scholars and scientists at the universities. The needed funds were diverted from the ordinary budget. Thus, the initiatives of the PGC turned it to become a moving force in the development of certain academic fields and not just an organ for the channelling of governmental funds. Indeed, during the second term of the PGC (1980-1985) its power and status increased further. It was no more a passive participant in budgeting of universities but became an active initiator of development in higher education, especially in time when governmental allocation were cut time and again and research funds, national and international, became scarce (see Table III). While the student population at universities has grown by 30% at that period, academic staff decreased by 3% and administrative staff was reduced by 11%. (See Table IV).

The share of higher education in the national budget (excluding defence expenditure and debt payment) fell by some 44% (see Table V). Thus, in a period when higher education in Israel has been experiencing substantial financial disinvestment ''the PGC's authority in the allocation of the higher education budget to the higher education system is, essentially, unlimited'' (CHE, PGC Report 12, 1984/85, p. 96).

The PGC operates through five budgetary channels: the direct global allocation; matching allocations; allocations for research; earmarked allocations; and allocations for development. Through each of these channels the PGC exerts influence on the running of higher education. The best example of the increased power and control of the PGC is reflected in its policy in regard to the largest item of the budget, namely, the direct allocations

to the institutions of higher education. This item made up about 85% of the total PGC budget in 1979/80 and decreased to about 75% in 1985/86, because ''the PGC preferred to preserve, and even increase, the real value of its special allocations'' (Ibid, p. 101). This trend is even more evident in PGC's direct allocations relative share in the ordinary budget of the universities which decreased from 65.8% in 1979/80 to 45.6% in 1986/87 (see Table III). As a result budgetary restrictions primarily affected the direct allocations of the PGC to higher education while increasing the share of the budget which the PGC could use to support special needs in accordance with its own determined priorities. Thus, the PGC increased its earmarked funding for basic research and special projects which suffered severely in the early 1970s.

Another example for the PGC's increased influence on higher education relates to its method of and criteria for apportioning the direct allocation between higher education institutions. According to the method formulated in 1981/82 and which is still in use, budgetary deliberations are conducted on two parallel planes. One team, headed by the PGC's Director-General, examines the budgetary proposals submitted by each institution, the indices on which they are based, the independent income of the institution, proposed academic and administrative changes and all other elements that serve as a basis for the determination and allocation of the PGC's direct budgetary allocatin. The second team, headed by the Chairman of the PGC, examines the most recent data on the ''productivity'' of each institution. These include

the number of students and their degree level and field of study, the number of graduates by degree and field of study, the value of research grants and other data reflecting the scope and quality of research in the institution. This data has no direct reference to the size of its staff, its building or any other background data of a given university. There is no single formula upon which calculations of an institution's ''productivity'' are based, since ''the PGC believes that no such unequivocal formula is possible''. The rationale for refraining from establishing one binding formula for funding was described by PGC's Chairman as follows: ''a single, pre-determined formula gives the omnipotent computer the power of decision rather than the collective balanced judgement of the committee members''. (Ibid, p. 102).

The range of allocation (not a single amount), as determined by the second team on the basis of various formulas mentioned above, is compared with the proposals of the first team. If the two coincide they are presented to the PGC for discussion and approval. If there is any discrepancy between the analysis based on the ''productivity'' of the institution and the analysis of the institution's budget proposal, the PGC takes both into consideration. In this way the PGC determines annually the allocation to each institution, based on its work program, proposed development and on its research ''output'' as well as on its training of academic manpower.

Autonomy and Control

In recent years universities have questioned the validity of the allocation methods employed by the PGC and in many instances protested against its decisions. The lack of an established definite formula for ''productivity'' of an institution leaves to the PGC the authority to ''assess'' the ''quality'' of the universities' performance. This policy no doubt weakened the integrity of universities in Israel, and limited their autonomy, a phenomenon which was observed in many national systems during the 1960s and 1970s (Perkins, 1972; Clark, 1983).

The PGC's controlling power is reflected also by the requirement from the universities to inform the PGC of their intention to open new units, any organizational change in an existing unit or developmental project ''regardless of how marginal or unimportant it may seem'' even when no request is made for Governments funding. Again, this practice was questioned by the Committee of Heads of Universities who are organized voluntarily and represent the ''higher education interest''. The reason for this was their worry over the power it might give to the PGC in ranking the ''productivity'' of universities and the evaluation of the quality of certain proposed programs. It remains to be seen the effects of PGC's measures like the ''productivity'' criteria and the evaluating process of the quality of proposed new programs on the autonomy of the universities.

Another area where the PGC might have a decisive influence on assessing the quality of particular institutions is within the

''Competitive Funds''. The PGC has set up a number of funds which award grants to individual researchers and research teams in universities, based on personal or team excellence recommended by selection committees. Allocations from the Fund for Scientific Equipment are also awarded by selection committees, which weigh the quality of research programs submitted by teams of researchers. These funds amount in 1985/86 to 6.2% and 6.4% in 1986/87 of the total budget allocated by the Government to higher education (See Table VI).

Additional means of evaluating the quality of teaching and research consists of periodic inspection of departments and research units by ''review committees'' from outside the institution. Although ''the PGC's policy is not to take part in these checks but to recommend that the university administration appoint from time to time external review committees which would present their reports to the administration'' (CHE, 1985, p.67), it encouraged individual institutions to act on these lines. PGC reviews periodically fields of study within the higher education system as a whole by ''survey committees''. Thus, for example, the PGC has appointed in April 1987 an international visiting committee to reiview ''the place and role of the universities' schools of education in the framework of the educational system in Israel and within their institutional framework''. The committee which was composed of Israeli and American professors submitted its report on December 7, 1988. If adopted, the far reaching recommendations of the report might have a decisive restructuring effect on schools of education both in content and structure as well as in their training and research functions.

The structure of study for the Bachelor's degree has been an issue on the agenda of the CHE and the PGC in recent years. One of the principal conclusions reached by the PGC in its guidelines for development and planning proposal for 1988-1995 stated:

> ''Undergraduate curricula at universities should be reviewed. Among other things an examination is needed of possibilities for broadening the framework of general and inter-disciplinary studies, and examination of the length of time required to study for the degree of Bachelor, the use of technologically advanced teaching aids and the study framework for older students reaching universities for a second round of studies''.(CHE, 1984, p.5).

The PGC initiated a comprehensive study of undergraduate education which was recently published (Zilberberg, 1987).

In its long-term planning the PGC forsees that, by 1995 when the student population is expected to reach 85,000 ''the feasibility of establishing undergraduate colleges that will award only the Bachelor's degree and for which universities will be academically responsible should be examined'' (CHE, 1987, p.35). However, at present, ''the PGC does not see a need for opening new institutions for higher education specializing in teaching toward a general Bachelor's Degree... most of the expected demands can be met by the existing system'' (CHE, 1988, p. 53). Any decision in the future to establish undergraduate colleges will necessarily influence the development policies of

diversification and differentiation of universities.

At this point it is too early to determine what will be the long term effects of the PGC's use of the ''productivity'' criteria, the ''Competitive Funds'', the ''survey committees'' and the plans to open undergraduate colleges on the autonomy of the universities. Some of these means will encourage diversities at the Departmental or Facultative levels within and between universities while others will probably accentuate the differences between individual institutions of higher learning as a whole. It will require a more detailed analysis of these policies to predict the future course of the higher education system in Israel in light of the PGC's role in recent developments. However, it is reasonable to conclude that worsening economic conditions as of the mid 1970s resulting in fiscal measures of reducing public expenditure including reduction in annual allocations to the universities, by 20% in 1982/83 - 1983/84 created a new policy climate, which might affect the delicate balance of autonomy and control between direct governmental intervention and the statutory roles of the CHE and the PGC on one hand and the universities on the other hand. Also, nationally negotiated wage agreements with faculty and staff were imposed on the universities but without commensurate provisions for funding. In his annual report for 1985/86 PGC's chairman took the opportunity ''to repeat previous warnings and stress that if higher education does not very soon advance in the national order of priorities, it will no longer be possible to repair the damage that higher education has suffered

in recent years'' (CHE 1987, p. 5). The theme of PGC's chairman report in the following year, 1986/87 was indeed ''the central and vital question: is the higher education system in danger of losing its independence?'' (CHE, 1988, p. 5). To halt the risk of further deterioration of the system both in academic standards and in its function of manpower training, the PGC has submitted to the government a plan to increase the allocations for higher education by 25% for the years 1988-1990 (Ibid, p. 6). On the other hand, demands for accountability were expressed by proposing that expanding and even existing needs for higher education could be met only by a more efficient and vocationally oriented system. These demands were followed by growing pressure for higher productivity and higher or joint utilization of facilities and equipment. University faculties and administrators tended to see some of these demands as a disguise of a desire for more direct state control at the expense of institutional autonomy. The outcomes of the present inherent tension between autonomy and control remain to be seen.

REFERENCES

Ben-David, Joseph (1986). Universities in Israel: Dilemmas of growth, diversification and administration, **Studies in Higher Education, 11**, pp. 105-130.

Bendor, Shmuel (1977). University Education in the State of Israel. In: Asa, S. Knowles (Editor-in-Chief) **International Encyclopedia of Higher Education** (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass), pp. 2331-2341.

Clark, Burton, R. (1983). **The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspectives** (Berkley and Los Angeles, University of California Press).

Dainton, Frederick (1977). University Grants Committees. In: Asa, S. Knowles (Editor-in-Chief) **International Encyclopedia of Higher Education** (San Francisco, Jossey Bass), pp. 1724-1729.

Central Bureau of Statistics (1988), **Statistical Abstracts of Israel No. 39** (Jerusalem, Government Printer).

Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee (1984). **The Higher Education System in Israel, Guidelines on the Development of the System and its Planning for 1988 with a First Glance at 1995** (Jerusalem, The Planning and Grants Committee).

Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee (1985). **Higher Education in Israel - Statistical Abstract 1983/84** (Jerusalem, The Planning and Grants Committee).

Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee (1985) **Annual Report No. 12, Academic Year 1984/85** (Jerusalem, The Planning and Grants Committee).

Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee (1987). **Annual Report No. 13, Academic Year 1985/86** (Jerusalem, The Planning and Grants Committee).

Council for Higher Education (1987), **Report No. 2, The Sixth Council 1981-1986** (Jerusalem: The Council for Higher Education).

Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee (1988). **Annual Report No. 14, Academic Year 1986/87** (Jerusalem, The Planning and Grants Committee). (Hebrew).

Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee (1988). **Higher Education in Israel - Statistical Abstract** 1986/87 (Jerusalem, The Planning and Grants Committee).

Halperin, Samuel (1984). **Any Home a Campus: Everyman's University of Israel**. (Washington, D.C., Institute for Educational Leadership).

Iram, Yaacov (1980). Higher education in transition - the case of Israel - a comparative study, **Higher Education, 9**, pp. 81-95.

Iram, Yaacov (1983). Vision and fulfillment: the evolution of the Hebrew University, 1901-1950, **History of Higher Education Annual, 3**, pp. 123-143.

Kleinberger, Aharon, F. (1969). **Society Schools and Progress in Israel** (Oxford, Pergamon Press).

Perkins, James, A. and Barbara Baird Israel (Eds) (1972), **Higher Education: From Autonomy to Systems** (New York, International Council for Educational Development).

Stanner, Ruth (1963). **The Legal Basis of Education in Israel** (Jerusalem, Ministry of Education and Culture).

Zadok, Meir (1984). The Israeli Planning and Grants Committee at the crossroads: from shock absorber to steering wheel, **Higher Education, 13**, pp. 535-544.

Zilberberg, Ruth (1987). **The Studies for the First Degree in the Higher Education System** (Jerusalem: CHE, PDC, 1987).

Table i. Fields of Study in the Institutions of Higher Education.

	Human-ities	Social Sci.	Law	Arts	Social Work	Teacher Train.	Math., Nat. Sci.	Eng., Tech-nology	Agri-cult.	Medi-cine	Den-tistry	Para. Med. Profs.
Hebrew University	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
Technion-IIT		+				+	+	+	+	+		
Tel-Aviv University	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+
Bar-Ilan University	+	+	+	+	+	+	+					
University of Haifa	+	+		+	+	+	+					
Ben-Gurion University	+	+			+	+	+	+		+		+
Weizmann Inst. Science							+					
Everyman's (Open) Univ.	+	+					+					
Bezalel Academy Arts				+								
Jerusalem Acad. Music				+		+						
Jerusalem Coll. Technol.						+		+				
Shenkar - Text. & Fash.				+				+				
Ruppin Institute		+										
Coll. of Administration		+										
Teacher Training Colleges						+						

Source: Council for Higher Education, Report No. 2, 1981-1986.

TABLE II. STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITIES, BY ACADEMIC YEARS.

YEAR	GROWTH INDEXES		ANNUAL PERCENTAGE OF GROWTH	TOTAL*
	1969/70=100.0	1964/5=100.0		
1948/49	..	..	..	1,635
1949/50	..	..	..	2,450
1959/60	..	..	14.8**	10,202
1964/5	..	100.0	12.5**	18,368
1969/70	100.0	197.3	14.6**	36,239
1970/1	110.6	218.2	10.6	40,087
1971/2	125.2	247.0	13.2	45,365
1972/3	135.1	266.5	7.9	48,942
1973/4	132.8	262.1	-1.6	48,140
1974/5	143.7	283.6	8.2	52,088
1975/6	144.9	285.9	0.8	52,510
1976/7	146.2	288.4	0.9	52,980
1977/8	149.2	294.3	2.0	54,060
1978/9	154.0	303.7	3.2	55,790
1979/80	158.7	313.0	3.1	57,500
1980/1	162.7	321.0	2.6	58,970
1981/2	167.6	330.7	3.0	60,735
1982/3	172.1	339.5	2.7	62,365
1983/4	178.3	351.7	3.6	64,605
1984/5	179.5	354.1	0.7	65,050
1985/6	182.6	360.2	1.7	66,160
1986/87	185.3	365.6	1.5	67,160
1987/88	187.4	369.7	1.1	67,900

* Including foreign students and students in special programs.

** On the assumption of linear growth within the years.

Source: Council for Higher Education, Planning and Grants Committee, **Higher Education in Israel - Statistical Abstracts 1983/84; 1986/87.** **Statistical Abstracts of Israel**, No. 39, 1988.

TABLE III ORDINARY BUDGET OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM, BY SOURCES OF INCOME AND ACADEMIC YEARS.

ACADEMIC YEAR(1)	VARIOUS(4)	DONATIONS FROM ABROAD	TUITION FEES	P.G.C. ALLOCATIONS				ORDINARY BUDGET
				EARMARKED ALLOCATIONS AND VARIOUS(3)	MATCHING ALLOCATIONS(2)	DIRECT ALLOCATIONS	TOTAL	
			N.I.S. THOUSANDS, AT CURRENT PRICES					
1979/80	159	126	64	52	50	867	969	(5)1,318
1980/81	450	260	133	108	225	2,228	2,561	(5)3,404
1981/82	1,132	505	272	150	400	4,138	4,688	(5)6,597
1982/83	3,754	1,205	1,405	569	600	13,326	14,495	(5)20,859
1983/84	25,763	5,944	3,290	3,702	1,363	36,623	41,688	(6)76,685
1984/85	43,387	42,199	29,603	24,079	8,820	153,075	185,974	(7)301,163
1985/86	43,503	57,741	99,256	38,629	38,254	253,037	329,920	(7)530,420
1986/87	89,179	80,087	124,085	49,540	43,904	324,625	418,069	(7)711,420
			PERCENTAGES					
1979/80	12.1	9.6	4.8	3.9	3.8	65.8	73.5	100.0
1980/81	13.2	7.6	3.9	3.2	6.6	65.5	75.3	100.0
1981/82	17.2	7.6	4.1	2.3	6.1	62.7	71.1	100.0
1982/83	18.0	5.8	6.7	2.7	2.9	63.9	69.5	100.0
1983/84	33.6	7.7	4.3	4.8	1.8	47.8	54.4	100.0
1984/85	14.4	14.0	9.8	8.0	3.0	50.8	61.8	100.0
1985/86	8.2	10.9	18.7	7.3	7.2	47.7	62.2	100.0
1986/87	12.5	11.3	17.4	7.0	6.2	45.6	58.8	100.0

(1) FROM OCTOBER 1 UP TO SEPTEMBER 30. (2) TO ENDOWMENT FUNDS AT THE INSTITUTIONS. (3) INCL. ALLOCATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND FOR SPECIAL SUBJECTS (EARMARKED ALLOCATIONS, INTER-UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES, AID TO STUDENTS, BUDGETARY TRANSFERS AND MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS). (4) INCL. DEFICITS. (5) ACCORDING TO THE BALANCE SHEETS OF THE INSTITUTIONS. (6) ACCORDING TO FINANCIAL REPORTS RECEIVED FROM THE INSTITUTIONS. (7) FINAL BUDGET AT UPDATED PRICES.

Source: CHE, Higher Education in Israel-Statistical Abstracts, 1986/87, p.56.

Table iv : Ordinary Budget for Higher Education as a Fraction of the Government's Ordinary Budget, 1973-1983 (1)

Budget Year	Share of Allocation for Higher Education in State Budget (as percentage)
1973	7.9
1974	7.0
1975	5.3
1976	4.6
1977	5.6
1978	4.8
1979	5.9
1980	5.5
1981	4.4
1982	4.9
1983	4.4

(1) Not including defense expenditure and interest payments on debts.

Source: The Higher Education System in Israel 1984.

Table v Trends in University System, over Period 1974-1983

	1974	1983	Percentage Change
No. of Students	48,140	62,500	+30%
Academic Staff (positions)	6,630	6,451	-3%
Administrative and Technical Staff (positions)	9,120	8,094	-11%
Non-salary Expenditure	3,754	2,791	-26%
Share of Higher Education in State Ordinary Budget, excluding expenditure on defense or interest on debts (percentage)	7.9	4.4	-44%
Total Floor-space of Existing Buildings (in thousand sq. mts.)	854	1,300	+52%
Total Development Budget[1]	3,815	1,350	-65%
PGC Participation in Development Budget[1]	1,897	370	-81%

1 Interim estimate for 1983 in millions of shekels (1983 prices). Assumed that prices will rise 124% from 1982 to 1983

Source: The Higher Education System in Israel, 1984.

TABLE VI. APPORTIONMENT OF PGC ALLOCATIONS (IN NIS AND AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ALLOCATIONS)

	1985/86		1986/87	
Total (NIS Thousands)	331.121.4	100%	439.381.4	100%
Direct allocations to the institutions of higher education	242.912.0	76.4%	311,905.0	73.9%
Allocations for electronics and computers	10.125.0		12,855.0	
Matching allocations to endowment funds	38,253.7	11.5%	43,904.4	10.0%
Earmarked allocations for research and special subjects *	20,398.5	6.2%	28,172.1	6.4%
Other allocations **	18,230.7	5.5%	41,114.9	9.4%
PGC's administrative budget	1,201.5	0.4%	1,430.0	0.3%

* Includes allocations for research, earmarked allocations, and inter-university activities.

** Includes aid to students, miscellaneous subjects and budgetary transfers.

Sources: CHE, **PGC Annual Report No. 13**, 1985/86, **No. 14**, 1986/87.